A U M

Look for the real beneath the unreal; look for the substance behind the shadow.
—WILLIAM Q. JUDGE

THEOSOPHY

Vol. XLIII April, 1955 No. 6

THE EDUCATION OF THE FUTURE

THE depression which has overtaken many "liberal" thinkers during recent years is certainly understandable. Since the eighteenth century reformers and humanitarians have placed their greatest faith in the process of education. The great educational ideals of Western civilization were born in the period known as the "Enlightenment"; they found expression in the brilliant minds of men like Rousseau and other educational pioneers, and during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries vast sums of money and almost endless devotion were given to the development of great public systems of education which became the pride of the modern world.

Yet today, at a time to which men of the past might easily have looked forward as promising a climax in the achievement of modern civilization, great clouds of fear and feelings of foreboding hover over all the populous nations of the world—over even the most "civilized" of peoples. Critics are horrified by the susceptibilities of the masses to the claims of demagogues and false prophets. The formulas developed by men like Hitler for arousing and exploiting mob emotions were not destroyed by the great military crusade of the 1940's. Teachers write in disgust of the failure of modern education; scientists who have given their entire careers to the pursuit of truth view the absorption by the State of the professional youth of this generation with feelings akin to shame and sorrow.

Education, in short, is either a relative failure, or it is not enough. This is a conclusion accepted with difficulty by those who have placed their faith in eighteenth-century revolutionary ideas. For it seems to

slam the door on any realistic hopes for a future which may be at once peaceful, prosperous, and free. The recrudescence of conservatism makes a natural attraction for the faint-hearted among those of liberal mind, while others who become impatient may be captured by one or another of the neo-fascist movements which are everywhere available. The present is plainly a low point in the resources of human aspiration, so far as the great masses are concerned. While intuitive individuals may press onward in their endeavors, stirred to further effort by an inspiration which comes from within and which they cannot explain, nor need to, it is a time of apathy and sluggishness for those who, in other epochs, are carried along to better things by the infectious enthusiasm of a rising tide of moral strength and expectation.

Theosophists, although they have better reason than most to retain their balance while living in this atmosphere, can hardly hope to be completely immune to the time's anxieties. No human being who still possesses a psychic nature which has karmic connections with the race at large can avoid feeling, if not in some small measure submitting to, the tugging liens of uncertainty, the sadness which comes from being able to do so little about the far-reaching tragedies of the world. The fissures in the apathy of the masses seem so few, so slight and shallow. Each day the world spins crazily by to keep its thousand and one unworthy appointments, while wisdom languishes, so to say, on the shelf, with only a handful to wonder if it may be there at all.

It is a time, then, to muse upon the quality and substance of the human nature which confronts us. For text, there is this from *Isis Unveiled*:

> . . . *the religion of the ancients is the religion of the future.* A few centuries more, and there will linger no sectarian beliefs in either of the great religions of humanity. Brahmanism and Buddhism, Christianity and Mahometanism will all disappear before the mighty rush of *facts.*

Here is a timetable which deals in *centuries,* so that the first lesson to be learned is one of patience. Yet "religion" implies something more than a body of doctrines, a collect of tenets maintained by groups of earnest students against the grain of their age. "Religion," here, is surely suggestive of the wider meaning of a broad and all-pervasive *culture* such as may support, as the atmosphere supports the dirigible,

the higher aspirations and faith of multitudes. In our own age, no such culture as yet exists, so that students, as they strain their efforts to gain the attention of the unhappy, and even the despairing, often meet only the dull eyes of unfeeling attachment to the bonds of present-day belief, or lack of belief.

Here, perhaps, lies the secret of the future—that the world will be upborne and helped to enter a new life upon that day when the strength of the new culture, a *theosophic* culture, is able to make itself felt.

Students of Theosophy who feel the weight of ignorance and pain all about them are perhaps undergoing a course of instruction in what may be called the mathematics of human evolution. The billions of egos in the world—for when we think of the human race, we must think of billions—are the visible expression of the great classes of monads described in *The Secret Doctrine.* It is notable that, unlike past cycles in which human greatness has emerged, the present is initiating into a common sort of self-consciousness all these masses of souls. Inevitably, the mass, finding a level in some sense proportional to the mass degree of evolution, will display the attributes and traits most representative of them all, taken as a whole. This is very different from other periods, when the break-out from old ways of thought was accomplished by brilliant cultures of almost tiny dimensions—the Periclean Greeks, the eighteenth-century *philosophes,* the Founding Fathers of the United States.

Today, a new kind of emergence seems potential in the cycles which lie ahead—the emergence of excellence in a *mass* society. This has never occurred before—unless, perhaps, we accept the great form achieved by Gotama Buddha as an example, or return to the legendary Golden Ages of what, so far as we are concerned, is pre-history. We mourn, today, the plight of the "ordinary man"—who is so much the same everywhere, whose name is legion. He will not listen; he is enjoying his glass of beer; he is watching television; he is forever going to the beach; he is preoccupied by an unconscionable number of trivialities, none of them "bad," yet they fill his life completely, and while he is far from happy—usually the reverse—no honest and undeniable sorrow ever makes him think.

He is, alas, an offprint of the times, even as the social psychologists maintain. He is a product of his culture, such as it is—its victim as well as its perpetuator.

It would be a miracle indeed if the "masses" were to turn in a body to Theosophy—as wonderful as it would be if students, now wrestling with their own mysterious destinies, were to wake tomorrow full-blown adepts. There is a rate of human progress, a pace in the unfolding of cycles of evolution, and the gamut of experience typified in the chapters of the *Bhagavad-Gita* has to be undergone, not once, but over and over again, until each note in the scale of uprising self-consciousness has been clearly sounded and has accomplished its vibratory reorganization of attitude and perceptive powers.

There is a difference, however, in the education afforded by the "religion of the ancients" and the education proposed by the eighteenth-century champions of human progress. In the mystery religions of old were ciphers within ciphers, and meanings embodied in the language of the soul that each man could read in his own way, according to his degree. The true teachings of the philosophy of soul may have countless superficial forms, but their inner content is such that it touches a mind *because it is a mind,* a heart *because it is a heart.*

In every collective evolution the most self-conscious members of society set about the rooting of culture most deliberately. They establish the "lines of force" by their own thought and behavior. Then others enter the pattern so created. They, also, try to understand the principles on which the patterns were originated, and so on: down through every degree, until, at the most primitive levels, there is little more than the simple glimmering of self-consciousness which strives to occupy the forms of thought elaborated by others who have gone on.

What must always be remembered is that self-consciousness always opens to wider reaches of perception: *this* is the true evolution. And, as the hour for self-reliant choice comes closer for more and more egos, the independence of the soul becomes increasingly important, the reverent repetition of form and ritual less and less. For then the trial will be upon us, and no loyalty to a form will help the man who thinks to substitute his faithfulness for the daring which the cycle demands.

The culture, then, of human awakening, will not be a "traditional" one in the familiar sense. It will be a culture in which self-reliance is the keynote, and thinking the act of devotion. The brotherhood of souls is the brotherhood of the free.

THE SCIENCE OF LIFE

[The affirmative aspect of H.P.B.'s iconoclasm appeared in her championship of those who were sincere devotees of universal ethics. These she honored, no matter what their "religion" or reputation in the world of men. Many of the "esotericists unaware" called themselves free-thinkers, atheists or agnostics, but the name signified only a rejection of orthodox Churchianity. Count Tolstoi was a case in point. H.P.B. wrote that "no Christian surpasses him in the practical bearing out of the principles alleged to have been preached on the Mount." She said, "his whole life is an exemplar of Christ-like altruism and self-sacrifice." In her article, "Diagnoses and Palliatives," where she defends Tolstoi's *Kreutzer Sonata,* he is characterized as "the greatest psychologist" of the nineteenth century. Tolstoi's daughter, Alexandra, has written that "it was impossible for him to be with any one for even a few minutes without transferring himself into the innermost being of that person."

The present article first appeared in *Lucifer,* November, 1887, and was last printed in THEOSOPHY 32: 245—Eds., THEOSOPHY]

WHAT is Life? Hundreds of the most philosophical minds, scores of learned well-skilled physicians, have asked themselves the question, but to little purpose. The veil thrown over primordial Kosmos and the mysterious beginnings of life upon it, has never been withdrawn to the satisfaction of earnest, honest science. The more the men of official learning try to penetrate through its dark folds, the more intense becomes that darkness, and the less they see, for they are like the treasure-hunter, who went across the wide seas to look for that which lay buried in his own garden.

What is then this Science? Is it biology, or the study of life in its general aspect? No. Is it physiology, or the science of organic function? Neither; for the former leaves the problem as much the riddle of the Sphinx as ever; and the latter is the science of death far more than that of life. Physiology is based upon the study of the different organic functions and the organs necessary to the manifestations of life, but that which science calls living matter, is, in sober truth, *dead matter.* Every molecule of the living organs contains the germ of death in itself, and begins dying as soon as born, in order that its successor-molecule should live only to die in its turn. An organ, a natural part of every living being, is but the medium for some special function in life, and is a combination of such molecules. The vital

organ, the *whole,* puts the mask of life on, and thus conceals the constant decay and death of its parts. Thus, neither biology nor physiology are the science, nor even branches of the *Science of Life,* but only that of the *appearances* of life. While true philosophy stands Oedipus-like before the Sphinx of life, hardly daring to utter the paradox contained in the answer to the riddle propounded, materialistic science, as arrogant as ever, never doubting its own wisdom for one moment, biologises itself and many others into the belief that it has solved the awful problem of existence. In truth, however, has it even so much as approached its threshold? It is not, surely, by attempting to deceive itself and the unwary in saying that life is but the result of molecular complexity, that it can ever hope to promote the truth.

Is vital force, indeed, only a "phantom," as Du-Bois Reymond calls it? For his taunt that "life," as something independent, is but the *asylum ignorantiae* of those who seek refuge in abstractions, when direct explanation is impossible, applies with far more force and justice to those materialists who would blind people to the reality of facts, by substituting bombast and jaw-breaking words in their place. Have any of the five divisions of the functions of life, so pretentiously named—Archebiosis, Biocrosis, Biodiaeresis, Biocaenosis and Bioparodosis,* ever helped a Huxley or a Haeckel to probe more fully the mystery of the generations of the humblest ant—let alone of man? Most certainly not. For life, and everything pertaining to it, belongs to the lawful domain of the *metaphysician* and psychologist, and physical science has no claim upon it. "That which hath been, is that which shall be; and that which hath been is named already—and it is known that it is MAN"—is the answer to the riddle of the Sphinx. But "man" here, does not refer to *physical* man—not in its esoteric meaning, at any rate. Scalpels and microscopes may solve the mystery of the material parts of *the shell of man*: they can never cut a window into his soul to open the smallest vista on any of the wider horizons of being.

It is those thinkers alone, who, following the Delphic injunction, have cognized life in their *inner* selves, those who have studied it thoroughly in themselves, before attempting to trace and analyze its reflection in their outer shells, who are the only ones rewarded with some measure of success. Like the fire-philosophers of the Middle

* Or Life-origination, Life-fusion, Life-division, Life-renewal and Life-transmission.

Ages, they have skipped over the *appearances* of light and fire in the world of effects, and centered their whole attention upon the producing arcane agencies. Thence, tracing these to the one abstract cause, they have attempted to fathom the MYSTERY, each as far as his intellectual capacities permitted him. Thus they have ascertained that (1) the *seemingly* living mechanism called physical man, is but the fuel, the material, upon which life feeds, in order to manifest itself; and (2) that thereby the inner man receives as his wage and reward the possibility of accumulating additional experiences of the terrestrial illusions called lives.

One of such philosophers is now undeniably the great Russian novelist and reformer, Count Leo N. Tolstoi. How near his views are to the esoteric and philosophical teachings of higher Theosophy will be found on the perusal of a few fragments from a lecture delivered by him at Moscow before the local Psychological Society.

Discussing the problem of life, the Count asks his audience to admit, for the sake of argument, *an impossibility.* Says the lecturer:

Let us grant for a moment that all that which modern science longs to learn of life, it has learnt, and now knows; that the problem has become as clear as day; that it is clear how organic matter has, by simple adaptation, come to be originated from inorganic material; that it is as clear how natural forces may be transformed into feelings, will, thought, and that finally, all this is known, not only to the city student, but to every village schoolboy, as well.

I am aware, then, that such and such thoughts and feelings originate from such and such motions. Well, and what then? Can I, or cannot I, produce and guide such motions, in order to excite within my brain corresponding thoughts? The question—what are the thoughts and feelings I ought to generate in myself and others, remains still, not only unsolved, but even untouched.

Yet it is precisely this question which is the *one* fundamental question of the central idea of life.

Science has chosen as its object a few manifestations that accompany life; and *mistaking** the part for the whole, called these manifestations the integral total of life. . . .

---

*"Mistaking is an erroneous term to use. The men of science know but too well that what they teach concerning life is a materialistic fiction contradicted at every step by logic and fact. In this particular question science is abused, and made to serve personal hobbies and a determined policy of crushing in humanity every spiritual aspiration and thought. "*Pretending* to mistake" would be more correct.—H.P.B.

The question inseparable from the idea of life is not *whence* life, but *how one should live that life*: and it is only by first starting with this question that one can hope to approach some solution in the problem of existence.

The answer to the query "How are we to live?" appears so simple to man that he esteems it hardly worth his while to touch upon it. . . . One must live the best way one can—that's all. This seems at first sight very simple and well known to all, but it is by far neither as simple nor as well known as one may imagine. . . .

The idea of life appears to man in the beginning as a most simple and self-evident business. First of all, it seems to him that life is in himself, in his own body. No sooner, however, does one commence his search after that life, in any one given spot of the said body, than one meets with difficulties. Life is not in the hair, nor in the nails; neither is it in the foot nor the arm, which may both be amputated; it is not in the blood, it is not in the heart, and it is not in brain. It is everywhere and it is nowhere. It comes to this: life cannot be found in any of its dwelling-places. Then man begins to look for life in Time; and that, too, appears at first a very easy matter. . . . Yet again, no sooner has he started on his chase than he perceives that here also the business is more complicated than he had thought. Now I have *lived* fifty-eight years, so says my baptismal church record. But I know that out of these fifty-eight years I slept over twenty. How then? have I lived all these years, or have I not? Deduct the months of my gestation, and those I passed in the arms of my nurse, and shall we call this life, also? Again, out of the remaining thirty-eight years, I know that a good half of that time I slept while moving about; and thus, I could no more say in this case, whether I lived during that time or not. I may have lived a little, and vegetated a little. Here again, one finds that in time, as in the body, life is everywhere, yet nowhere. And now the question naturally arises, whence, then, that life which I can trace to nowhere? Now—will I learn. . . . But it so happens that in this direction also, what seemed to me so easy at first, now seems impossible. I must have been searching for something else, not for my life, assuredly. Therefore, once we have to go in search of the whereabouts of life—if search we have to—then it should be neither in space nor in time, neither as cause nor effect, but as a something which I cognize within myself as quite independent from Space, time and causality.

That which remains to do now is to study *self*. But how do I cognize life in myself?

This is how I cognize it. I know, to begin with, that I live; and that I live wishing for myself everything that is good, wishing this since I can remember myself, to this day, and from morn till night. All that lives outside of myself is important in my eyes, but only in so far as it co-operates with the creation of that which is productive of *my* welfare. The Universe is important in my sight only because it can give *me* pleasure.

Meanwhile, something else is bound up with this knowledge in me of my existence. Inseparable from the life I feel, is another cognition allied to it; namely, that besides myself, I am surrounded with a whole world of living creatures, possessed, as I am myself, of the same instinctive realization of their exclusive lives; and that all these creatures live for their own objects, which objects are foreign to me; that those creatures do not know, nor do they care to know, anything of my pretensions to an exclusive life, and that all these creatures, in order to achieve success in their objects, are ready to annihilate me at any moment. But this is not all. While watching the destruction of creatures similar in all to myself, I also know that for me too, for that precious ME in whom alone life is represented, a very speedy destruction is lying in wait.

It is as if there were two "I's" in man; it is as if they could never live in peace together; it is as if they were eternally struggling, and ever trying to excel each other.

One "I" says, "I alone am living as one should live, all the rest only seems to live. Therefore, the whole *raison d'être* for the universe is in that I may be made comfortable."

The other "I" replies, "The universe is not for thee at all, but for its own aims and purposes, and it cares little to know whether thou art happy or unhappy."

Life becomes a dreadful thing after this!

One "I" says, "I only want the gratification of all my wants and desires, and that is why I need the universe."

The other "I" replies, "All animal life lives only for the gratification of its wants and desires. It is the wants and desires of animals alone that are gratified at the expense and detriment of other animals; hence the ceaseless struggle between the animal species. Thou art an

animal, and therefore thou hast to struggle. Yet, however successful in thy struggle, the rest of the struggling creatures must sooner or later crush thee."

Still worse! life becomes still more dreadful. . . .

But the most terrible of all, that which includes in itself the whole of the foregoing, is that:—

One "I" says, "I want to live, to live for ever."

And that the other "I" replies, "Thou shalt surely, perhaps in a few minutes, die; as also shall die all those thou lovest, for thou and they are destroying with every motion your lives, and thus approaching ever nearer suffering, death, all that which thou so hatest, and which thou fearest above anything else."

This is the worst of all. . . .

To change this condition is impossible. . . . One can avoid moving, sleeping, eating, even breathing, but one cannot escape from thinking. One thinks, and that thought, *my* thought, is poisoning every step in my life, as a personality.

No sooner has man commenced a conscious life than that consciousness repeats to him incessantly without respite, over and over the same thing again. "To live such life as you feel and see in your past, the life lived by animals and many men too, lived in *that* way, which made you become what you are now—is no longer possible. Were you to attempt doing so, you could never escape thereby the struggle with all the world of creatures which live as you do—for their personal objects; and then those creatures will inevitably destroy you." . . .

To change this situation is impossible. There remains but one thing to do, and that is always done by him who, beginning to live, transfers his objects in life outside of himself, and aims to reach them. . . . But, however far he places them outside his personality, as his mind gets clearer, none of these objects will satisfy him.

Bismarck, having united Germany, and now ruling Europe—if his reason has only thrown any light upon the results of his activity—must perceive, as much as his own cook does who prepares a dinner that will be devoured in an hour's time, the same unsolved contradiction between the vanity and foolishness of all he had done, and the eternity and reasonableness of that which exists for ever. If they only think of it, each will see as clearly as the other; *firstly*, that the preservation of the integrity of Prince Bismarck's dinner, as well as that of

powerful Germany, is solely due: the preservation of the former—to the police, and the preservation of the latter—to the army; and that, so long only as both keep a good watch. Because there are famished people who would willingly eat the dinner, and nations which would fain be as powerful as Germany. *Secondly,* that neither Prince Bismarck's dinner, nor the might of the German Empire, coincide with the aims and purposes of universal life, but that they are in flagrant contradiction with them. And *thirdly,* that as he who cooked the dinner, so also the might of Germany, will both very soon die, and that so shall perish, and as soon, both the dinner and Germany. That which shall survive alone is the Universe, which will never give one thought to either dinner or Germany, least of all to those who have cooked them.

As the intellectual condition of man increases, he comes to the idea that no happiness connected with his personality is an achievement, but only a necessity. Personality is only that incipient state from which begins life, and the ultimate limit of life.

Where, then, does life begin, and where does it end, I may be asked? Where ends the night, and where does day commence? Where, on the shore, ends the domain of the sea, and where does the domain of land begin?

There is day and there is night; there is land and there is sea; there is life and there is *no* life.

Our life, ever since we became conscious of it, is a pendulum-like motion between two limits.

One limit is, an absolute unconcern for the life of the infinite Universe, an energy directed only toward the gratification of one's own personality.

The other limit is a complete renunciation of that personality, the greatest concern with the life of the infinite Universe, in full accord with it, the transfer of all our desires and good will from one's self, to that infinite Universe and all the creatures outside of us.*

The nearer to the first limit, the less life and bliss, the closer to the second, the more life and bliss. Therefore, man is ever moving from one end to the other; *i.e.* he lives. THIS MOTION IS LIFE ITSELF.

And when I speak of life, know that the idea of it is indissolubly connected in my conceptions with that of *conscious* life. No other life

* This is what the Theosophists call "living *the* life"—in a nut-shell.—H.P.B.

is known to me except conscious life, nor can it be known to anyone else.

We call life, the life of animals, organic life. But this is no life at all, only a certain state or condition of life manifesting to us.

But what is this consciousness or mind, the exigencies of which exclude personality and transfer the energy of man outside of him and into that state which is conceived by us as the blissful state of love?

What is conscious mind? Whatsoever we may be defining, we have to define it with our conscious mind. Therefore, with what shall we define mind? . . .

If we have to define all with our mind, it follows that conscious mind cannot be defined. Yet all of us, we not only know it, but it is the only thing which is given to us to know undeniably . . . .

It is the same law as the law of life, of everything organic, animal or vegetable, with that one difference that we *see* the consummation of an intelligent law in the life of a plant. But the law of conscious mind, to which we are subjected as the tree is subjected to its law, we *see* it not, but fulfil it. . . .

We have settled that life is that which is not our life. It is herein that lies hidden the root of error. Instead of studying that life of which we are conscious within ourselves, absolutely and exclusively—since we can know of nothing else—in order to study it, we observe that which is devoid of the most important factor and faculty of our life, namely, intelligent consciousness. By so doing, we act as a man who attempts to study an object by its shadow or reflection does.

If we know that substantial particles are subjected during their transformation to the activity of the organism; we know it not because we have observed or studied it, but simply because we possess a certain familiar organism united to us, namely the organism of our animal, which is but too well known to us as the material of our life; *i.e.* that upon which we are called to work and to rule by subjecting it to the law of reason. . . . No sooner has man lost faith in life, no sooner has he transferred that life into that which is no life, than he becomes wretched, and sees death. . . . A man who conceives life such as he finds it in his consciousness, knows neither misery, nor death; for all the good in life for him is in the subjection of his animal to the law of reason, to do which is not only in his power, but takes place unavoidably in him. The death of particles in the animal being, we

know. The death of animals and of man, as an animal, we know; but we know nought about the death of conscious mind, nor can we know anything of it, *just because that conscious mind is the very life itself.* And *Life can never be Death. . . .*

The animal lives an existence of bliss, neither seeing nor knowing death, and dies without cognizing it. Why then should man have received the gift of seeing and knowing it, and why should death be so terrible to him that it actually tortures his soul, often forcing him to kill himself out of sheer fear of death? Why should it be so? Because the man who sees death is a sick man, one who has broken the law of his life, and lives no longer a conscious existence. He has become an animal himself, an animal which also has broken the law of life.

The life of man is an aspiration to bliss, and that which he aspires to is given to him. The light lit in the soul of man is bliss and life, and that light can never be darkness, as there exists—verily there exists for man—only this solitary light which burns within his soul.'

We have translated this rather lengthy fragment from the Report of Count Tolstoi's superb lecture, because it reads like the echo of the finest teachings of the universal ethics of true theosophy. His definition of life in its abstract sense, and of the life every earnest theosophist ought to follow, each according to, and in the measure of, his *natural* capacities—is the summary and the Alpha and the Omega of practical psychic, if not spiritual life. There are sentences in the lecture which, to the average theosophist, will seem too hazy, and perhaps incomplete. Not one will he find, however, which could be objected to by the most exacting, practical occultist. It may be called a treatise on the Alchemy of Soul. For that "solitary" light in man, which burns for ever, and can never be darkness in its intrinsic nature, though the "animal" outside us may remain blind to it—is that "Light" upon which the Neo Platonists of the Alexandrian school, and after them the Rosecroix and especially the Alchemists, have written volumes, though to the present day their true meaning is a dark mystery to most men.

True, Count Tolsoi is neither an Alexandrian nor a modern theosophist; still less is he a Rosecroix or an Alchemist. But that which the latter have concealed under the peculiar phraseology of the Fire-

philosophers, purposely confusing cosmic transmutations with Spiritual Alchemy, all that is transferred by the great Russian thinker from the realm of the metaphysical unto the field of practical life. That which Schelling would define as a realization of the identity of subject and object in the man's inner Ego, that which unites and blends the latter with the universal Soul—which is but the identity of subject and object on a higher plane, or the unknown Deity—all that Count Tolstoi has blended together without quitting the terrestrial plane. He is one of those few *elect* who begin with intuition and end with *quasi*-omniscience. It is the transmutation of the baser metals—*the animal mass*—into gold and silver, or the philosopher's stone, the development and manifestation of man's higher SELF which the Count has achieved. The *alcahest* of the inferior Alchemist is the *All-geist,* the all-pervading Divine Spirit of the higher Initiate; for Alchemy was, and is, as very few know to this day, as much a spiritual philosophy as it is a physical science. He who knows nought of one, will never know much of the other. Aristotle told it in so many words to his pupil, Alexander: "It is not a stone," he said, of the philosopher's stone. "It is in every man and in every place, and at all seasons, and is called the *end* of all philosophers," as the *Vedanta* is *the end* of all philosophies.

To wind up this essay, *The Science of Life,* a few words may be said of the eternal riddle propounded to mortals by the Sphinx. To fail to solve the problem contained in it, was to be doomed to sure death, as the Sphinx of life devoured the unintuitional, who would live only in their "animal." He who lives for Self, and only for *Self,* will surely die, as the higher "I" tells the lower "animal" in the lecture. The riddle has seven keys to it, and the Count opens the mystery with one of the highest. For, as the author on "Hermetic Philosophy" beautifully expressed it: "The real mystery most familiar and, at the same time, most unfamiliar to every man, *into which he must be initiated or perish as an atheist, is himself.* For him is the elixir of life, to quaff which, before the discovery of the philosopher's stone, is to drink the beverage of death, while it confers on the adept and the *epopt,* the true immortality. He may know truth as it really is—*Aletheia,* the breath of God, or Life, the conscious mind in man."

This is "the Alcahest which dissolves all things," and Count Tolstoi has well understood the riddle.

—H.P.B.

WORD PUZZLES

IN an earlier discussion of this series, during discussion of the word *ethics,* an attempt was made to draw some useful distinctions between *ethics* and *morality* (THEOSOPHY, June, 1954). The derivation of both terms suggests that clear distinctions are advisable and, furthermore, as noted at that time, "it is easily conceivable that more could be written concerning the words *ethics* and *morality* than about any other two terms in the English language. This, for the reason that, from a theosophical point of view, every man has a concern with establishing some measure of consistency, purpose, and general helpfulness to others—and also finds he is being measured by the yardstick of other peoples' customs."

In this case, the "word puzzle" consists in the fact that a man may, as with Socrates, be considered *immoral* by the society in which he lives and yet be a great ethical teacher and exemplar—a truly moral man, if one uses the term in its best or highest sense. When is apparently moral man immoral? Not only when he falsely rationalizes his own conduct, but also when he judges and condemns others in a manner which shows no respect for ideas and ideals different from his own. While many "moral" customs are derived from valid ethical principles and may inspire to ethical conduct, other "moral" customs and attitudes apparently exert an opposite sort of influence, particularly when the moralist is prideful of his supposed virtue, and contemptuous or condemnatory of those whose behavior follows a differing pattern. Theosophy, it has been said truly, is the *essence* of morality—that is, composed of the ethical principles which underlie philosophic concepts of goodness, justice, etc. But, by the same token, teachers of Theosophy have, almost without notable exception, been branded as "immoral" by hostile contemporaries who possessed vested interest in the established order.

Along with such abbreviated analysis it is interesting to isolate some of Madame Blavatsky's and William Q. Judge's statements on the limitations of the "moral" or "conventional"—perhaps one should say, moralistic—point of view. To begin with, H.P.B. was at no time more vehement than when calling attention to the fact that the Theosophist would find himself, of necessity, renouncing popular categories of "good" and "evil." The reason for her insistence, and

for a similar emphasis in some of William Q. Judge's remarks in *Letters That Have Helped Me*, seems clearly to be that if a man believes in the combined self-reliance and inescapable responsibility suggested by the view of reincarnation, he cannot foreshorten his viewpoint on human conduct by the self-righteous standards of custom. The "conventional way," unthinkingly pursued, involves far too much of self-righteousness and prejudice to encourage justice in dealing with one's fellows or growth in one's own understanding.

H.P.B's most impressive statements on this subject occur in her article, "What is Truth?", first printed as a leading editorial in *Lucifer* for February, 1888. She introduces her thesis by noting that "to approach even terrestrial truth requires, first of all, *love of truth for its own sake,* for otherwise no recognition of it will follow. And who loves truth in this age for its own sake? How many of us are prepared to search for, accept, and carry it out, in the midst of a society in which anything that would achieve success *has to be built on appearances, not on reality, on self-assertion, not on intrinsic value?*" That Madame Blavatsky has little respect for what modern psychologists frequently call "the social self" is attested by her further statement that the average man, in his societal relationships, "allows himself usually to be drifted down from cradle to grave, nailed to the Procrustean bed of custom and conventionality." She continues:

> Now conventionality—pure and simple—is a congenital LIE, as it is in every case a "*simulation* of feelings according to a received standard" (F. W. Robertson's definition); and where there is any simulation *there cannot be any truth.* How profound the remark made by Byron, that "truth is a gem that is found at a great depth; whilst on the surface of this world all things are weighed *by the false scales of custom,*" is best known to those who are forced to live in the stifling atmosphere of such social conventionalism, and who, even when willing and anxious to learn, dare not accept the truths they long for, for fear of the ferocious Moloch called Society.

Further philosophical dimensions of this challenging argument are supplied by a discussion of selfishness, extracted from portions of the same article, and also from *The Key to Theosophy.* In the *Key*, H.P.B. remarks that "selfishness is essentially conservative, and hates being disturbed." In "What is Truth?", she adds the following in a similar context of discussion:

> SELFISHNESS, the first-born of Ignorance, and the fruit of the teaching which asserts that for every newly-born infant a new soul,

> *separate and distinct* from the Universal Soul, is "created"—this Selfishness is the impassable wall between the *personal* Self and Truth. It is the prolific mother of all human vices. *Lie* being born out of the necessity for dissembling, and *Hypocrisy* out of the desire to mask *Lie*. It is the fungus growing and strengthening with age in every human heart in which it has devoured all better feelings. Selfishness kills every noble impulse in our natures, and is the one deity, fearing no faithlessness or desertion from its votaries. Hence, we see it reign supreme in the world, and in so-called fashionable society. As a result, we live, and move, and have our being in this god of darkness under his trinitarian aspect of Sham, Humbug, and Falsehood, called RESPECTABILITY.

Mr. Judge carries on the development of the principles involved in Madame Blavatsky's paragraphs in one of his letters of philosophical "advice" to Jasper Niemand, bringing the matter down to the every-day psychological level of a student's life. The way of the moralist, he implies, is to abhor, shun, or grow righteously indignant upon observing some species of conduct which he feels clearly merits our disapprobation. "But," Judge writes, "to turn away in horror is not detachment. That is, if we love vice or anything, it seizes on us by attachment; if we hate anything, it seizes on our inner selves by reason of the strong horror we feel for it. In order to prevent a thing we must understand it; we cannot understand while we fear or hate it. We are not to love vice, but are to recognize that it is a part of the whole, and trying to understand it, we thus get above it. This is the 'doctrine of opposites' spoken of in *Bhagavad-Gita.* So if we turn in horror from the bad (we may feel sad and charitable, though), in a future life we will feel that horror and develop it by reaction into a reincarnation in a body and place where we must in material life go through the very thing we now hate."

> Good and Evil are only the two poles of the one thing. For in the Absolute one is just as necessary as the other, and often what seem evil and "pain" are not absolutely so, but only necessary adjustments in the progress of the soul. Read *Bhagavad-Gita* as to how the self seems to suffer pain. What is Evil now? Loss of friends? No; if you are self-centered. Slander? Not if you rely on Karma. There is only evil when you rebel against immutable decrees that must be worked out. You know that there must be these balancings which we call Good and Evil. Just imagine one man who really was a high soul, now living as a miser and enjoying it. You call it an evil; he a good. Who is right? You say "Evil" because you are speaking out of the True; but the True did know

> that he could never have passed some one certain point unless he had that experience, and so we see him now in an evil state. Experience we must have, and if we accept it at our own hands we are wise. That is, while striving to do our whole duty to the world and ourselves, we will not live the past over again by vain and hurtful regrets, nor condemn any man, whatever his deeds, since we cannot know their true cause. We are not Karma, we are not the Law, and it is a species of that hypocrisy so deeply condemned by It for us to condemn any man. That the Law lets a man live is proof that he is not yet judged by that higher power. Still, we must and will keep our discriminating power at all times.

These points of emphasis are hardly isolated remarks, being implied, at least, in some way in nearly everything written by Mr. Judge and Madame Blavatsky. There is also abundant evidence that, wherever distinctive theosophical ideas have occurred in a philosopher's writings, one finds a similar insistence. Given the perspective of reincarnation and Karma, it is seen to be absolutely necessary to refrain from judging either our own conduct or that of anyone else in terms of appearances, and to make sure that whatever "judgments" are passed simply represent a decision that a given action is not one we can commend or must oppose. The conventional moralist, however, is interested in more than action; he presumes to judge the motive and ultimate character of the one who acts. Thus it is that the theosophical philosopher is apt to show an especial capacity for appreciation of the non-conformist. The non-conformist, or genuine "radical," whatever his ignorance and whatever his appearance, is at least so concerned with the task of discovering true principles for his own conduct that he has little time or inclination for censuring others. His Karma is more truly *his own,* his standards being self-induced and self-devised rather than borrowed from a social or religious consensus. Moreover, the temptation to dishonesty is far less, since there is absolutely no incentive for pretending to embrace a popular morality; the nonconformist morality, by definition, is unpopular anyway.

Emerson proffered a ringing paragraph on this subject in his essay, "Self-Reliance."

> Whoso would be a man, must be a nonconformist. He who would gather immortal palms must not be hindered by the name of goodness, but must explore if it be goodness. Nothing is at last sacred but the integrity of your mind. Absolve you to yourself, and you shall have the suffrage of the world. I remember an answer which when quite young I was prompted to make to a valued adviser who

> was wont to importune me with the dear old doctrines of the church. On my saying, "What have I to do with the sacredness of traditions, if I live wholly from within?" my friend suggested,—"But these impulses may be from below, not from above." I replied, "They do not seem to me to be such; but if I am the Devil's child, I will live then from the Devil." No law can be sacred to me but that of my nature. Good and bad are but names very readily transferable to that or this; the only right is what is after my constitution; the only wrong what is against it. A man is to carry himself in the presence of all opposition as if every thing were titular and ephemeral but he. I am ashamed to think how easily we capitulate to badges and names, to large societies and dead institutions.

These points of emphasis are particularly impressive, coming from Emerson, for he was in his own conduct, we understand, the most circumspect of men. It is not only those who carry on a kind of personal war with social standards, then, who protest the soul-stultifying effects of custom; matters of profound philosophic import and matters of self-reliance are also involved. Emerson continues by saying:

> The populace think that your rejection of popular standards is a rejection of all standard, and mere antinomianism; and the bold sensualist will use the name of philosophy to gild his crimes. But the law of consciousness abides. There are two confessionals, in one or the other of which we must be shriven. I have my own stern claims and perfect circle. It denies the name of duty to many offices that are called duties. But if I can discharge its debts it enables me to dispense with the popular code. If any one imagines that this law is lax, let him keep its commandment one day.
>
> And truly it demands something godlike in him who has cast off the common motives of humanity and has ventured to trust himself for a taskmaster. High be his heart, faithful his will, clear his sight, that he may in good earnest be doctrine, society, law, to himself, that a simple purpose may be to him as strong as iron necessity is to others!

Going far back in the theosophic tradition to the philosophy of Gautama Buddha—he whom H.P.B. referred to as the greatest religious teacher the world has ever known—we find the following remarks preserved in *The Dhammapada*: "Not merely by moral precepts and observances," the Buddha said, "does one earn the right to be called a sage," nor find release from ethical dilemmas. Further, he said, "a man is not a Bhikkhu because he begs alms from others; he who merely outwardly adopts all forms is not on that account a Bhikkhu. He is in reality called '*The Bhikkhu*' who in this world has cast

out both merit and demerit, who lives a life of purity, and who, with full realization, walks in this world." So strong is this current in Buddhist thought that despite the development of a formal Buddhist priesthood and the deterioration of much of Buddhism into ritualism, some elements of high-minded tolerance toward the apparent wrong-doings of others have been preserved among Buddhist votaries to this day. The Buddhist has always claimed that "no tonsure can make an ascetic," as Buddha pointed out, and conversely, that outward appearances cannot be depended upon to give full measure of a man nor of the nature of his soul-striving.

Such attacks on conventional morality seem to be necessary in order to help overcome the delusion that matters of right and wrong can properly be determined by vote or agreement. Neither that which most people want nor that which most people believe provides the right to pass judgment, and all of history attests to the fact that "morality by social agreement" inhibits philosophical growth. As Dwight MacDonald noted in his essay, *The Root is Man*:

> If what most people want is one's criterion of value, then there is no problem involved beyond ascertaining what in fact people *do* want—a question that can indeed be answered by science, but not the one we started out with: Is a scientifically-grounded ethics possible? For this answer simply raises the original question in different form: why *should* one want what most people want? The very contrary would seem to be the case: those who have taught us what we know about ethics, from Socrates and Christ to Tolstoy, Thoreau, and Gandhi, have usually wanted precisely what most people of their time did *not* want, and have often met violent death for that reason.

In conclusion, then, we have, in these remarks concerning *morality,* a practical example of why it is sometimes necessary to attack prevailing attitudes of mind—even to challenge and condemn them, as did H.P.B. and Emerson—in order to allow the *soul's* vision to come through clearly. And here, as elsewhere, it may be rewarding to ponder the additional fact that men of theosophical persuasion have only condemned the condemnatory attitude itself. Two negatives, as has often been pointed out, manage to cancel each other out, leaving opportunity for the emergence of positive, constructive ideals.

THE GITA AND THE BIBLE

EVER since the earliest days of our era, and even up to the present time, an intellectual battle of words has raged around the Christian doctrine of "Salvation." St. Paul, judging by the emphasis given the subject in his various epistles, evidently labored to the extent of his ability to clear men's minds on this most important of philosophical quandaries—yet the battle still continues if somewhat abated. Most orthodox Christians, unfortunately, are of the opinion that the idea of salvation is peculiar to their own creed, that before the advent of Christ the promise of immortality had not been made. An impartial study of the world's great religions, however, reveals an entirely different story. The central theme of every religious philosophy, from pre-Vedic Buddhism to modern Theosophy, has been the immortality of the soul, the possibility, as well as the promise, of a life of unbroken conscious existence in spirit even after the death of the body. It is true that men's ideas about heaven and hell differ, and that the condition of immortality, as well as the means by which it is to be achieved, are as much at variance as are the temperaments of the people to whom the doctrine was declared. But the teaching itself is universal, not limited to time or locality, and by this fact alone, it deserves the respect of enquiring minds.

Are men saved through grace, as the gift of God, or are they saved through works, performed by themselves? Advocates of either opinion find little difficulty collecting material to support their particular views. Advocates of neither, however, show the willingness, as a rule, to weigh with impartiality the seemingly contradictory statements dealing with the subject. Yet, it is only by open-minded research, by the resolving of seeming paradoxes, that the truth beneath any fundamental question can be glimpsed. Is it too much to suppose that great religious teachers deliberately clothe their doctrines in paradoxes for the purpose of making men think? The world in which we live is a world of relativities, a world wherein we see only partially, as through a veil. How can we be so ignorant as to suppose, therefore, that the ultimate truth on the subject of salvation, or on any subject, can be declared in a word, a sentence, or even a volume? Just as the diamond has many sides, each of which sheds a brilliant ray of light, so with the jewel of truth. There are numberless angles, or points of view, on

every question, each of which, when resolved, leads a step nearer to the light of Truth complete. But as men of this earth, possessed of finite minds, we cannot know final Truth. We must be content to be progressively moving in the direction of it. How, then, can we afford to dogmatize, to ignore or declare unsound any statement of doctrine or principle that purports to be truth, whether the statement be made by Peter or Paul, by Buddha, Zoroaster, Krishna, or Christ?

> For by grace you have been saved through faith; and this is not your own doing, it is the gift of God—not because of works, lest any man should boast. (Eph. 2:8-9.)
>
> . . . work out your own salvation with fear and trembling. (Phil. 2:12.)

To the student of esoteric philosophy, who is provided in Theosophy with the key to all old scriptures, the apparent contradiction of these two statements is only an illusion. In the light of the theosophical doctrine of "dual man," practically all contradictions disappear. It is the teaching of *The Secret Doctrine* that man is two-fold in his being: first, a higher spiritual nature, the God in each, which is eternal and all-knowing; second, a lower imperfect personality, the temporary vehicle or abode of the inner God. Lest the personal man should boast, not only about his salvation, but about any good thing that he might have achieved, H. P. Blavatsky reminds us that "the key to all our successes . . . is in our recognition of the fact of the Higher Self—colourless, cosmopolitan, unsectarian, sexless, unworldly, altruistic—and the doing of our work on that basis." The noble thoughts of men, their aspirations and impulses toward a higher life, have their roots, not in the lower personal mind, which is cold and selfish, but in the impersonal Higher Self, or God, in each.

In St. Paul's day, as much as at the present time, the struggle of discipleship was the subjugation of the man of flesh, the surrender of one's self to Christ, as it was called, which meant, evidently, the merging of the individual consciousness with the spirit of God within. In this sense, there is no salvation outside the Christ spirit, for while each individual Ego is under the necessity of *working out* ways and means of subduing the self, and of shifting the center of consciousness from the personal to the impersonal, the resultant status of salvation is from above—a "gift," so to say, from the higher to the lower self. Immortality is achieved, say the Buddhists, when "the dewdrop slips

into the shining sea." The immortality, however, is more of the sea than of the drop. How, then, can any man boast?

Those who argue the question of salvation—whether it be through grace, as the gift of God, or through works performed by the individual himself—are very much in the position of those who dispute the question of fate *or* free will. Some, as we know, take the view that man is the victim of fate, of external forces over which he has no control. Others see indubitable evidence that man is not the victim of fate, but has free will, and that effort brings its sure reward. The mistake made in considerations of this kind is the taking of sides, the position or belief that one or the other of these views is wholly without foundation. The experiences of life lead us to see, however, that such is not the case, that both fate and free will are natural, necessary factors in life. For without free will, man could not institute new causation, and without fate, he could not reap the effects. Both are necessary parts of life. Similarly with the question of salvation. Those who argue the principle of salvation by grace look at only one side of the whole, and being partial, fall very often into the passive position of doing nothing by way of works. Feeling themselves secure, such individuals are always in danger of believing that actions are of no account, inasmuch as things done or undone can in no way affect their status in heaven. This obviously is a great mistake, for good works and the abstaining from evil are of utmost importance—as the following verses from both the Old and New Testaments clearly indicate:

> What shall we say then? Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? By no means! How can we who died to sin still live in it? (Rom. 6:1-2.)
>
> For the wages of sin is death, but the free gift of God is eternal life in Christ Jesus our Lord. (Rom. 6:23.)
>
> You therefore, beloved, knowing this beforehand, beware lest you be carried away with the error of lawless men and lose your own stability. But grow in grace and knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. (II Pet. 3:17-18.)
>
> Salvation is far from the wicked, for they do not seek thy statutes. (Ps. 119:155.)
>
> Refrain from anger, and forsake wrath! Fret not yourself: it tends only to evil. For the wicked shall be cut off, but those who wait for the Lord shall possess the land. (Ps. 37:8-9.)
>
> Trust in the Lord, and do good; so you will dwell in the land, and enjoy security. Take delight in the Lord. (Ps. 37:3-5.)

> Mark the blameless man, and behold the upright, for there is posterity for the man of peace. But transgressors shall be altogether destroyed; the posterity of the wicked shall be cut off. (Ps. 37:37-38.)

It is ignorance of the law of Karma, and of the relationship of the individual self to the One Universal Spirit, that has led men into the delusion of thinking that the immortality of their souls is secure, regardless of the nature of acts performed on earth. The spiritual ray in man, the real and enduring part of his being, it is true, cannot be extinguished, for, like all other of the countless rays animating forms of things and beings from atom to archangel, it is an indivisible portion of the Universal Divine Flame. But the Soul, the consciousness and intelligent *reflection* of that ONE, must *win* its immortality. This it can do only by uniting itself with the parent Source, by turning its energies in the direction of Brotherhood and unselfishness instead of in the direction of personal desires and ambitions.

The eternality of the Spirit, therefore, is one thing, and the immortality of the soul quite another—though the two are hopelessly confused in the minds of non-philosophic religionists. It is the latter alone—the immortality of soul—over which the men of this earth have control, and which should be the concern of every practical philanthropist who is more interested in the enduring welfare of his fellow men than in any state of eternal selfish bliss for himself. Being eternal and indestructible, the divine spark travels endlessly through the good and evil corridors of time, for the immutable and just law of compensation, or Karma, affixes a result to every thought, feeling or act. The soul, therefore, stands under the necessity of "working out" its own salvation, of gradually merging its consciousness with the Real, whereby it becomes progressively more fitted to help and teach others. Karma either binds the soul to continued rebirth against its will, or yields up its freedom to choose for itself the manner of its devotions.

Salvation, to the ancients, never meant the attainment after death of a state of static bliss, wherein the soul *sits* forever on the right hand of the Father. With the wise and philosophical pagans, it referred always to the liberation of the soul from the restrictive bonds of matter. It was a state of spiritual awareness and activity, and it was here on earth, where the entanglement is felt and can be grappled with, that the release must be achieved. See the words of Krishna in *The Bhagavad-Gita*:

> He who, while living in this world and before the liberation of the soul from the body, can resist the impulse arising from desire and anger is a devotee and blessed. . . . Assimilation with the Supreme Spirit is on both sides of death for those who are free from desire and anger, temperate, of thoughts restrained; and who are acquainted with the true Self.

Students of comparative religion might see a significance in the fact that the last chapter of the *Gita* bears the title, "Devotion as regards Renunciation and final Liberation." It is only in this eighteenth chapter, after many long battles for discipline and self-mastery, that Krishna declares to Arjuna the doctrine of salvation by grace. He says:

> There dwelleth in the heart of every creature, O Arjuna, the Master—Ishwara—who by his magic power causeth all things and creatures to revolve mounted upon the universal wheel of time. Take sanctuary with him alone, O son of Bharata, with all thy soul; by his grace thou shalt obtain supreme happiness, the eternal place.

Men in all ages have striven to find one simple doctrine or law, which being known, salvation would be secured. The doctrine of grace, it might well be, *is* the one single vehicle for which men search. Yet, it is a law that cannot be availed of until disciples are first imbued with the meaning and importance of Karma, and with the bearing of right and wrong action on the destiny of their souls. It is thought by some that this very absence of Karma from the teaching of the Church is what has weakened Christianity, and has made of its adherents lip-serving theorists who, in spite of their apathy, expect to be saved vicariously by the blood of their Redeemer. But how appropriate, in this respect, are the following words of Jesus:

> O Jerusalem, Jerusalem . . . how often would I have gathered your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you would not! (Matt. 23:37.)

However great the knowledge and power of the Master, his ability to teach and help is equal only to the receptivity of the disciple. The Elder Brothers of Humanity are ready and anxious (in the higher meaning of that term) to help all younger souls on their journey to the hall of happiness, but They are limited by conditions which surround ourselves, and which we alone can change. Just as Arjuna had to pass through eighteen stages of self-discipline and preparation *under the Law* before the benediction of *grace* could be received, so might sincere and devoted Christians ponder the teaching that faith without works is of no avail, that the saving blood of Christ, unless poured into a worthy vessel, turns to gall and bitterness in the system.

THE CRESTS OF CYCLES

THAT events move in cycles is an ever-growing perception in the minds of men of natural science. Investigators have accumulated vast amounts of evidence that confirm the theosophical doctrine of periodicity. But though this evidence is drawn from every department of nature, and includes findings of the most varied kinds, the doctrine has yet to be elevated by authorities to the dignity of universal law. Science, as a whole, cuts itself off from fields of experience beyond the physical, wherein alone the arc of any cycle is complete. Theosophy, on the other hand, *begins* with the assumption of soul.

The Three Fundamental Propositions of *The Secret Doctrine* postulate eternal and unchanging laws of the Cosmos, which govern the greatest universe as well as the tiniest atom, on all planes of being. In the science of symbology, the tides of the sea provide fitting analogy to the principle of periodicity. Every tide, it is said, has its ebb, just as every cause sown by any human being has its commensurate effect. The latter is but the natural outcome of the former. Every wave, moreover, has its high and low points, its crest and its hollow, and wise boatmen know that on the surging crest alone can the forward impulse of the wave be utilized. To be caught in the backwash of the hollow means defeat.

Every gardener knows that for best results he must plant and harvest his crops according to the natural seasons of the year. What would we think of the planter who ignores the cycle of Spring, Summer, Autumn, and Winter, and depends for success upon his personal efforts alone? Or of the husbandman, who, ignoring the flow of sap, prunes his trees out of season? To the wise and observant farmer there is the proper cycle for doing everything that must be done. Everything in nature has its rhythmic, harmonious movement, and skillful actors in any line of endeavor are those who work meticulously with the law.

The principle of periodicity, one may say, is evident to farmers and husbandmen and those who work directly with nature. But what of dwellers in the city, who spend a large part of their lives in stuffy offices, and who seldom see a tree? What of the great mass of human beings who procure their sustenance, not from nature direct, but from market places, tin cans, and deep freeze? What have the crests to do with them? Yet periodicity applies everywhere. There is not an indi-

vidual who lives, nor any occupation in which a man may engage, but falls directly under the operation of universal law. Who has not experienced cases of the "blues," which, according to the observations of psychologists, reappear at definite intervals? Does not the urbanite feel hunger and drowsiness just as regularly and as acutely as a worker on the farm? Are not the cycles of heartbeat and breathing just as unfailing and as necessary to city folk as to people who live in caves? There is not a thing that we do, not an experience that we have, nor an undertaking we may engage in, but depends for its fruition upon some phase of the law of periodicity. Even efforts to improve the mind by study require the cooperative movement of cycles just as truly as the casting of seeds in Spring. The small result obtained by some students of philosophy is due, no doubt, to ignorance or neglect of this law.

Periodicity, philosophically considered, means that whatever the waters of life wash up to one's feet is but the commensurate return of what the man himself has sent out. Misfortune, trial, disease, unhappiness of any kind, as well as the opposites of these, are all ripples of effect. It is easy intellectually to perceive the principle of sowing and reaping, and to apply the principle philosophically to one's self. But intellectual recognition is not enough. To work constructively with the law, to align one's energies with the creative tides of nature, man must be able to calculate his position in relation to each cycle. Ignorance of "the meaning and the times of the cycles" leads to defeat.

Nothing can be done *against* cycles, said Wm. Q. Judge, but a whole lot can be done *in* them. Man's is the task of learning to so poise himself that he possesses the power to live on the crest of each wave of life.

Observant Theosophists are aware of the increased force that accompanies the return of "special days." The cycles represented by March 21, May 8, June 25, etc., being the return of impressions on planes of being other than the physical, impressions instituted in the first instance by Beings of a higher order, whose nature and purposes concern the welfare of the whole human race. Knowing the cycle is coming, and being prepared, students of true occultism, which is Theosophy, may benefit deeply by the influx of spiritual energy. Whatever one's life motive may be, whether good or evil, the tides of great impersonal cycles multiply it a hundredfold.

THE FIRST POWER

WHAT is WILL? Can exact science tell? What is the nature of that intelligent, intangible, and powerful something which reigns supreme over all inert matter? As an eternal principle, Will is not spirit. It is not substance. It is *everlasting* IDEATION. Will is the *force* of spirit in action, the first of all powers. "The great Universal Idea willed—and the cosmos sprang into being."

Emepht, the supreme first principle, in the Egyptian allegory, produced an egg; by brooding over which, and permeating the substance of it with its own vivifying essence, the germ contained within was developed. *Phtah,* the active creative principle, proceeded from it and began his work. From the boundless expanse of cosmic matter (astral light, ether, fire-mist, principle of life) which had formed itself under his breath (Will)—this creative principle (or "the law of evolution") by setting in motion the potencies latent in it, formed suns and stars, and satellites. It controlled their emplacement by the immutable law of harmony; and peopled them "with every form and quality of life." In the Hindu allegory, Kama was the first movement that stirred the ONE, after its manifestation from the purely abstract principle—to create. "Desire first arose in IT, which was the *primal germ of mind.* . . . Kama was born the first. Him, neither gods nor fathers (Pitara) nor men have equalled." Kama is pre-eminently the divine desire of creating happiness and love; it was by the arising of Desire in the unknown first cause, the one Absolute existence, that the whole collection of worlds was manifested, and by means of the influence of Desire in the now manifested world the latter is kept in existence.

Will is the one and sole principle of abstract eternal MOTION, or its ensouling essence. "In the beginning," the Zohar teaches, "was the Will of the King, prior to any other existence. It (the Will) sketched the forms of all things that had been concealed but now came into view. And there went forth from the head of Ain Soph, a nebulous spark of matter, without shape or form. . . . Life is drawn from below, and from above the source renews itself, the sea is always full and spreads its waters everywhere." It is in the *denial* of the boundless and endless Entity, possessor of that invisible Will which we for lack of a better term call God, that lies the powerlessness of every materialistic

---

NOTE.—Collated from standard theosophical works.

science to explain occult phenomena. The ancient philosophy affirmed that it is in consequence of the manifestation of that Will—termed by Plato *the Divine Idea*—that everything visible and invisible sprang into existence. As that Intelligent Idea which, by directing its sole will-power toward a centre of localized forces, called objective forms into being, so can man, the microcosm of the great Macrocosm, do the same in proportion with the development of his will power. As God creates, so man can create. Given a certain intensity of will, and the shapes created by the mind become *subjective.* Hallucinations, they are called, although to their creator they are real as any visible object is to any one else. Given a more intense and intelligent concentration of this will, and the forms become concrete, visible, objective; the man has learned the secret of secrets; he is a Magician.

Dzyu is the one real (magical) knowledge, or occult wisdom, which, dealing with eternal truths and primal causes, becomes almost omnipotent when applied in the right direction. Its antithesis is Dzyu-mi, that which deals with illusions and false appearances only, as in our exoteric modern sciences. Dzyu is the expression (in the highest sense) of the collective Wisdom of the Dhyani-Buddhas (Archangels). The latter are the Primordial SEVEN. Of their WILL, Fohat becomes the "Messenger"—the fiery whirlwind, in Kosmos. No connected understanding of the sway of WILL in the Kosmos and in man can be had, without some consideration of those hierarchies of divine and cosmic forces which form the Vehicle for its manifestation.

Occultism teaches that the Dhyan Chohans, the collective hosts of spiritual beings, are this vehicle for the manifestation of the divine and universal thought and will. In their totality they are known as Fohat. They are the intelligent forces that give to and enact in Nature her "laws," while themselves acting according to laws imposed upon them in a similar manner by still higher Powers. This hierarchy of spiritual Beings, through which the Universal Mind comes into action, is like an army—a "Host" truly—by means of which the fighting power of a nation manifests itself, and which is composed of army corps, divisions, brigades, regiments, and so forth, each with its separate individuality or life, and its limited freedom of action and limited responsibilities; each contained in a larger individuality, to which its own interests are subservient, and each containing lesser individualities in itself. Hence it is taught that WILL is septenary in its degree of

manifestation. "Emanating from the one, eternal, abstract and purely quiescent Will (Atma in Layam), it becomes Buddhi in its Alaya state, descends lower as Mahat (Manas), and runs down the ladder of degrees until the divine Eros becomes, in its lower, animal manifestation, erotic desire."

In its totality, Fohat represents the Hosts of the higher creative Dhyan Chohans. In the phenomenal and cosmic world Fohat is that occult, electric vital power which, under the Will of the Creative Logos, unites and brings together all forms, giving them the first impulse which becomes in time law. Fohat is thus the transcendental binding Unity of all cosmic energies, on the unseen as on the manifested planes, the action of which resembles—on an immense scale—that of a living Force created by WILL, in those phenomena where the seemingly subjective acts on the seemingly objective and propels it to action. In his secondary aspect, Fohat is the solar energy, the electric vital fluid, and the preserving fourth principle, the animal soul of Nature, so to say, or—Electricity. There are in the universe such beings as Angels or Spirits, whose *incorporeal* essence may constitute an intelligent entity notwithstanding the absence of any (to us) solid organism. In the words of *The Secret Doctrine,* there are *Formless* Radiations, existing in the harmony of Universal Will and being what we term the collective or aggregate of Cosmic Will, on the plane of the subjective universe.

Deity being absolute, must be omnipresent. Hence not an atom but contains IT within itself. Democritus taught, after his instructor Leucippus, that the first principles of all things contained in the universe were atoms and a vacuum. In the kabalistic sense, the *vacuum* means in this instance the *latent* Deity, or latent force, which at its first manifestation became WILL, and thus communicated the first impulse to atoms—whose agglomeration is matter. The imaginary atoms—a *figure of speech* employed by Democritus, and gratefully seized upon by the materialists—are like automatic workmen, moved inwardly by the influx of that universal Will directed upon them, and which, manifesting itself as force, sets them into activity. The plan of the structure to be erected is in the brain of the Architect, and reflects his will; abstract as yet, from the instant of the conception it becomes concrete through these atoms which follow faithfully every line, point and figure in the imagination of the Divine Geometer. Desire arises as the first cause; "behind Will stands Desire."

To this logic the materialist should not object, for he regards thought as matter. Conceding it to be so, the cunning mechanism contrived by the inventor; the fairy scenes born in the poet's brain; the gorgeous painting limned by the artist's fancy; the peerless statue chiselled in ether by the sculptor; the palaces and castles built in air by the architect —all these, though invisible and subjective, must exist, for they are matter, shaped and moulded. Who shall say that there are not some *men* of such imperial will as to be able to drag these air-drawn fancies into view, enveloped in the hard casing of gross substance to make them tangible?

In metaphysics and occult philosophy, Will is that which governs the manifested universes in eternity. Occultists speak of memory in every atom, of will and sensation. Every being is soaked through with the primordial essence called Will. It is a colorless power, to which no quality of goodness or badness can be assigned—but which may be used in whatever way man pleases. The thinking of oneself as this, that or the other, is the chief factor in the production of every kind of psychic or even physical phenomena. The words "whosoever shall say to this mountain be thou removed and cast into the sea, and *shall not doubt* . . . that thing will come to pass," are no vain words. Only the word "faith" ought to be translated by WILL. Faith without Will is like a wind-mill without wind—barren of results. When considered as that which in ordinary life is called Will, we see its operation only in connection with the material body and mind guided by desire. Looked at in respect to the hold by man upon life the will is more recondite, because its operation is beyond the ken of the (finite) mind. In ordinary life it is not man's servant, but being then guided solely by desire it makes man a slave to his desires.

As in Kosmos, so in man, the Will is first of all powers. The human Will is all-powerful, and the Imagination is a most useful faculty with a dynamic force. Paracelsus teaches that determined will is the beginning of all magical operation. "It is because men do not perfectly imagine and believe the result, that the (occult) arts are so uncertain, while they might be perfectly certain." "Kriyashakti" is the mysterious power of thought which enables the latter to produce external, perceptible, phenomenal results by its own inherent energy. The ancients held that any idea will manifest itself externally if one's attention is deeply concentrated upon it. Similarly an intense volition will be followed by the desired result. "Kriyashakti is the mysterious and divine

power latent in the will of every man, which if not called to life, quickened and developed by Yogi-training, remains dormant in 999,999 men out of a million, and gets atrophied." Parasara explains that when Brahma wants to create the world anew and construct progeny *through his will,* in the fourfold condition or four orders of beings termed Dhyan Chohans, more material devas, Pitris or Progenitors, and men —"he collects Yoga-like his mind."

Every man, in common with every other living being, and even inert object, has an *aura* of his own emanations surrounding him; and, moreover, is enabled by a trifling effort to transport himself in *imagination* wherever he likes. Imagination is the greatest power, after Will, in the human assemblage of complicated instruments. It is the king faculty, inasmuch as the Will cannot do its work if the Imagination be at all weak or untrained. Why should it not be scientifically possible that man's thought, regulated, intensified, and guided by the powerful magician, the educated Will, may become corporealized for the time being, and appear to whom it likes, a faithful double of the original? There is no reason why one should suppose that the adept, the alchemist, the savant of the secret art should not have found out that which scientists today deny, but may discover true tomorrow, *i.e.,* how to project electrically their astral bodies, in an instant, through thousands of miles of space, leaving their material shells with a certain amount of animal vital principle to keep the physical life going, and acting within their spiritual, ethereal bodies as safely and intelligently as when clothed with the covering of flesh. There is a higher form of electricity than the physical one known to experimenters; a thousand correlations of the latter are as yet veiled to the eye of the modern physicist, and none can tell where end its possibilities.

The adept is a man who, through the entire subjugation of matter of his corporeal system, has attained to that state of purification at which the spirit becomes nearly freed from its prison, and can produce wonders. His will, nay, a simple desire of his has become creative force, and he can command the elements and powers of Nature. The life-principle is but a blind force obeying a compelling influence. This blind force being totally submissive to his will, obeys it with servility. The will creates; for the will in motion is *force,* and force produces *matter.* This secret of secrets, that *soul* is not knit to flesh, was practically demonstrated in the instance of the Yogis, followers of Kapila.

Having emancipated their souls from the fetters of Prakriti (the physical perception of the senses and mind), they so developed their soul-power and *will-force,* as to have actually enabled themselves, while on earth, to communicate with the supernal worlds, and perform what is bunglingly termed "miracles."

When a firm position is assumed with the end in view of reaching union with Spirit through concentration, the latter comes to the aid of the lower self and raises it gradually to higher planes. In this process the Will by degrees is given a stronger and stronger tendency to act upon a different line from that indicated by passion and desire. With every effort of Will toward purification and unity with the Self-God, one of the lower rays breaks and the spiritual entity of man is drawn higher and ever higher to the ray that supersedes the first, until, from ray to ray, the inner man is drawn into the one and highest beam of the Parent-Sun. It is freed from the domination of desire and subdues the mind itself. But before the perfection of the practice is arrived at, the will still acts according to desire, only that the desire is for higher things and away from those of material life.

The fourth principle, Kama, is the basis of action and the mover of the Will. Will is absolutely colorless and varies in moral quality in accordance with the desire behind it; being moved by desire it operates in all kingdoms below man. The mysterious effects of attraction and repulsion are the *unconscious* agents of will. Fascination, such as we see exercised by some animals, by serpents over birds, for instance, is a *conscious* action of it, and the result of thought. Sealing-wax, glass, and amber, when rubbed, *i.e.,* when the latent heat which exists in every substance is awakened, attract light bodies; they exercise unconsciously *will.* For inorganic as well as organic matter possesses a particle of the divine essence in itself, however infinitesimally small it may be. And how could it be otherwise? Notwithstanding that in the progress of its evolution it may from beginning to end have passed through millions of various forms, it must ever retain its germ-point of that pre-existent matter, which is the first manifestation and emanation of the Deity itself. What is then this inexplicable power of attraction but an atomical portion of that essence that scientists and kabalists equally recognize as the "principle of life"—the Akasha? Granted that the attraction exercised by such bodies may be blind; but as we ascend higher the scale of organic beings in Nature, we find this

principle of life developing attributes and faculties which become more determined and marked with every rung of the endless ladder. Man, the most perfect of organized beings on earth, in whom matter and spirit—*i.e., Will*—are the most developed and powerful, is alone allowed to give a conscious impulse to that principle which emanates from him; and only he can impart to the magnetic fluid opposite and various impulses without limit as to the direction.

We believe Will-Power the most powerful of magnets. The adept has no need of any extraneous aids—the simple exertion of his will power is all sufficient. "Every created being," say the Fire-philosophers, "possesses his own celestial power and is closely allied with heaven. The spirit is everywhere diffused. The magic power of man, which can operate externally, lies hidden in the inner man. This magical wisdom and strength sleeps, but by a mere suggestion is roused into activity, and becomes more living the more the outer man of flesh and the darkness is repressed. Pure primeval magic does not consist in superstitious practices and vain ceremonies but in the imperial will of man, concealed in him as fire is concealed in the flint." This "magic" is ultimate attainment, by Will, to conscious God-hood.

PERSEVERANDO

The headstrong are really the sublime. The man who is only brave owes it to impulse; the man who is only valiant merely possesses that temperament; the man who is courageous has only one virtue; the man who is headstrong in the truth is sublime. All the secrets of great souls lie in the one word, *Perseverando.* Perseverance is to courage what the winch is to the lever, a perpetual renewal of the point of support. Let the goal be on earth or in heaven, to reach the goal is everything; in the first case one is Columbus, in the second case, Jesus. Never to disobey the dictates of your conscience, never to allow your will to be disarmed, results in suffering, but in triumph as well. The propensity of mortals to fall does not preclude the possibility of soaring. From the fall comes the ascension. Weak souls are disconcerted by specious obstacles; strong souls, never. Perish, they possibly may; conquer, they certainly will. You might give Stephen all sorts of good reasons why he should not let himself be stoned. This contempt for sensible objections gives birth to that sublime victory which is called martyrdom.

—VICTOR HUGO

YOUTH-COMPANIONS ASK— AND ANSWER

WE are told that the "path of altruism" especially requires selflessness and personal relinquishments. There are numerous examples, though, of professional men (psychiatrists, doctors, scientists, professors, etc.) who are devotedly furthering the welfare of their communities, and yet quite obviously have not relinquished any of the enjoyments of worldly life; they do not seem to have blocked the avenue which leads to deeper insights, nor lack inner security. Is this a contradiction?

(*a*) An interesting paradox is involved in considering what constitutes true or real altruism. For while "selflessness" and the relinquishment of purely personal desires seem to play an integral role, the capacity to be altruistic—to give of one's self for the common good—stems on the individual's development of his own potentialities. In short, for the individual to be able—let alone willing—to "help others," he first must have learned how to help, *i.e.,* unfold the constructive capacities within himself. Thus *one* form of "ego-centricity" is not at odds with altruism, but a necessary step in its accomplishment.

The type of professional men alluded to in the question—psychiatrists, doctors, scientists, and professors—are by definition engaged in work devoted to the increase of human understanding, and thus, in a broad sense, altruistic endeavor. The theosophic ideal, it seems, is not the abandonment of the personality, but the natural blending of the best components of the total man. Possibly some of the final steps on the "path of altruism" include obvious worldly relinquishments and various rigors of self-discipline, commonly known as *yoga,* but in terms of the general karma, for the Westerner, there is the obvious responsibility of working in and through existing society.

True altruism is the natural blossoming of the maturing individual. Premature and pseudo-altruism is sometimes based on misdirected motives—*e.g.,* the alleviation of old guilt feelings, a ticket to salvation, etc. Premature altruism is good intention misapplied, instead of by diligent efforts, directed at one's individual development as a step in aiding the development of mankind in general.

(*b*) No, it is not a contradiction. It is a kind of balance in the present life they are living, and we should be appreciative of the good

in their lives, rather than critical of any "imperfect behavior." These professional men are helping humanity with their work. So why shouldn't they also have time for the karma of their personal pleasure? This does not noticeably affect the welfare of communities in a harmful way.

We must remember that the relinquishing of personal enjoyments is not a matter of any set thing or things which if not given up show the beholder as not being on the "path of altruism." Men develop various parts of their natures at different times, and in different stages. One must have something, enjoy it to its fullest, in a sense become part of that thing, before he can give it up and know what he has given up, so that it will be a relinquishment. When we think all experiences will be or have been ours, we can see that they are necessary factors in the process of evolution. We need different combinations of experiences and attitudes of mind and environments. Thus only do we gain a true and complete picture of a particular situation, and have in that respect, gained knowledge.

An aptitude or insight when developed is not lost; yet the ego may find himself in an environment which influences him in an opposite direction from further developing, or even fully controlling, a certain part of his nature. A doctor, for instance, may have developed many intuitive insights, worked for the amelioration of suffering, yet also still be "part of the race" and partake of its sensual tendencies—drinking, overeating, partaking of casual amours, etc. These *are* detrimental influences from a Theosophical point of view, but should we not be more interested in what a man gives to others than in his weaknesses of personality? Thomas Paine's personal weaknesses did not detract from the importance of what he had to say and do.

Perhaps our civilization is so muddled and unaltruistic at this point that a contradiction of this sort existing in an educator or helper of the people should make us *optimistic* rather than pessimistic. Of course, if society as a whole were raised to a sufficiently sensitive level, this contradiction would most certainly be felt, and, on a different relative basis, would make what such an altruist had to contribute ineffectual or insufficient. The more awake in all departments a person is, the more sensitive he becomes to life and its many alternatives, the more he is aware of subtle inconsistencies and lacks. So, too, with a civilization. What the majority cannot see, in a sense, does not affect them.

(*c*) It might sound as a contradiction, but it is not, because there are two "paths of altruism" which should not be taken as one.

The first path of altruism is the one mentioned above. Let's, for example, take the life of a doctor. He gave many years of hard study and work to a good cause, a cause which he thinks will help humanity. When he begins his work, nothing else exists for him but the human being he wants to help and give relief. But as we all know, there is a time for work and a time for pleasure and recreation. A doctor, though, might give more time for the welfare of others, and his work naturally will require more selflessness and personal relinquishments than a mere businessman, whose main goal usually is dollars and cents. But this path of altruism does not necessarily expand the line of his duty, his work. After that work is done for the day, he will, just as much as anybody else, have an urge to plunge into the enjoyments of worldly life.

The second "path of altruism" is a quite different one. Many years ago, H.P.B. opened a school of occultism where she taught esoteric philosophy. The students who took part in her teachings "wished to KNOW the truth by their own direct personal experience, and to study occultism with the object of acquiring the wisdom and power, which they felt that they needed in order to help others, effectively and judiciously, instead of blindly and at haphazard. Therefore, sooner or later, they joined the inner section." Most of them therefore really did *try* to relinquish the enjoyments of worldly life.

In our time, we can take Gandhi as an example of someone who truly followed the path of altruism. When he was young, he still took part in the enjoyments of worldly pleasures, but as he grew older he wholly devoted his life to the welfare of his beloved country.

(*d*) The great majority of individuals in the world today have not reached the point in their evolution where such a steadfast, completely devoted life is their objective. Undoubtedly the individuals whom the questioner has in mind have sufficiently raised their outlook and their understanding of life so as to be further along the "path" than the general mass of humanity. But they demonstrate this by motives, not necessarily by "purity" of personal habits. For a person in this stage of development, the life led seems consistent enough with the outlook taken. A relationship between the soul's duty and the desires of material existence has not, though, been thought out on a conscious level.

It is said that animals should be left in their natural state to work out their own lines of evolution. Man's interference hinders this, but, since everything in life is pervaded by duality, isn't there some benefit to be derived by the animal that has been made a servant by man?

(*a*) If the wild animal is governed by man's thoughts and actions, the domesticated animal, in constant contact with man, most certainly is. Man's relationship varies with different animals. With some, such as the cow, there has been relationship of undestructive usefulness far back into the night of history. Many other animals have always remained happiest in the wild state. When captured and an attempt at domestication made, they remain savage and untamed, or they die from a longing for their natural habitat.

Evidently, then, what is the natural state for some animals is unnatural for others. Certain species gain in their evolution with man's assistance while others have not worked out that particular part of their evolution which requires that they have no contact with man.

Evolution in the lower kingdoms is by natural impulse. Individual consciousness and the power of choice are not present yet. The plan of evolution is there to follow, set by self-conscious beings. We know that nature unaided fails. We cannot separate nature and man, as the two are interconnected. Nature is influenced by man's thought and action. How could there be "savage" animals of no use to other beings if there were not savage, selfish ideas in the world? These undoubtedly give the "savage" animal the impetus to action. If all ideas were altruistic, animals would be gentle, responsive to all noble human feelings.

Only by such a sympathetic relationship of the conscious for the "unconscious" can true progress be obtained. When man abuses the animal, considering only his own pleasure, he is injuring his *own* development. Only a conscious realization of the responsibilities and the relationship involved will enable man to "help the less progressed."

(*b*) It is evident that animals not performing some useful function for man—and this without suffering—ought to be left in their natural habitat, where they play a part in the natural order of things. Man often takes them out of their proper environment for purposes of amusement, profit, etc., where the obvious results have wreaked havoc, disease, etc. These are crimes against nature, and the abuse of lower intelligences will not go unchecked by Great Nature's law.

ON THE LOOKOUT

The Wave of the Future

Speculations which appeared in biologist Harold H. Smith's article in the *Saturday Review* for Jan. 8 will be of particular interest to students of H. P. Blavatsky's *Secret Doctrine*. The title is "Education and the Control of Evolution." The writer, a professor at Cornell University, "takes a very cold, specialist's look at the human species, but comes up with the optimistic report that we are by no means on the losing end of a cosmic proposition." The global future for present ethnic groups, as Smith sees it, is amalgamation:

> The trend is toward greater mobility, less isolation, more frequent matings among individuals of diverse origins. Some of the accelerating factors are worldwide exploration and trade since the sixteenth century, movement toward large centers of population since the Industrial Revolution beginning in the eighteenth century, less formidable religious and class distinction barriers, increasingly rapid means of communication and transportation, and far-flung wars and conquests. If this present tendency should continue the choice of mate will be made independently of location, race, creed, etc.; chance and also migration would no longer be important factors in human evolution. Although it is not proposed that the ultimate in world *panmixia* will ever be attained, the broad trend is unmistakably in that direction.

"Races Born one from Another"

In her closing sections on the subject of anthropology (*S.D.* II, 443 *et seq.*), Madame Blavatsky has this to say about the transitions which may be expected in the composition of "racial" stock:

> The human Races are born one from the other, grow, develop, become old, and die. Their sub-races and nations follow the same rule. If your all-denying modern science and so-called philosophy do not contest that the human family is composed of a variety of well-defined types and races, it is only because the fact is undeniable; no one would say that there was no external difference between an Englishman, an African negro, and a Japanese or Chinaman. On the other hand it is formally denied by most naturalists that *mixed human races, i.e.,* the seeds for entirely new races, are any longer formed in our days. But this last is maintained on good grounds by de Quatrefages and some others.
>
> Nevertheless our general proposition will not be accepted. It will be said that whatever forms man has passed through in the long pre-

historic Past there are no more changes for him (save certain variations, as at present) in the future. Hence that our Sixth and Seventh Root Races are fictions.

To this it is again answered: How *do you* know? Your experience is limited to a few thousand years, to less than a day in the whole age of Humanity and to the present types of the actual continents and isles of our Fifth Race. How can you tell what will or will not be? Meanwhile, such is the prophecy of the Secret Books and their no uncertain statements. . . .

IMPERCEPTIBLE CHANGE

Now, Occult philosophy teaches that even now, under our very eyes, the new Race and Races are preparing to be formed, and that it is in America that the transformation will take place, and has already silently commenced.

Pure Anglo-Saxons hardly three hundred years ago, the Americans of the United States have already become a nation apart, and, owing to strong admixture of various nationalities and inter-marriage, almost a race *sui generis,* not only mentally, but also physically. "Every mixed race, when uniform and settled, has been able to play the part of a primary race in fresh crossings," says de Quatrefages. "Mankind, in its present state, has thus been formed, certainly, for the greatest part, by the successive crossing of a number of races *at present undetermined.*" (*"The Human Species,"* p. 274.)

Thus the Americans have become in only three centuries a "primary race," *pro tem.,* before becoming a race apart, and strongly separated from all other now existing races. They are, in short, the germs of the *Sixth* sub-race, and in some few hundred years more, will become most decidedly the pioneers of that race which must succeed to the present European or fifth sub-race, in all its new characteristics. . . . The Fifth will overlap the Sixth Race for many hundreds of millenniums, changing with it slower than its new successor, still changing in stature, general physique, and mentality, just as the Fourth overlapped our Aryan race, and the Third had overlapped the Atlanteans.

OVERLAPPING

This process of preparation for the Sixth great Race must last throughout the whole sixth and seventh sub-races (*vide supra,* the diagram of the Genealogical Tree of the Fifth Race). But the *last* remnants of the Fifth Continent will not disappear until some time after the birth of the *new* Race; when another and *new* dwelling, the sixth continent, will have appeared above the *new* waters on the face of the globe, so as to receive the new stranger. To it also will emi-

> grate and settle all those who shall be fortunate enough to escape the general disaster. When this shall be—as just said—it is not for the writer to know. Only, as nature no more proceeds by sudden jumps and starts, than man changes suddenly from a child into a mature man, the final cataclysm will be preceded by many smaller submersions and destructions both by wave and volcanic fires. The exultant pulse will beat high in the heart of the race now in the American zone, but there will be no more Americans when the Sixth Race commences; no more, in fact, than Europeans; for they will have now become a *new race, and many new nations.* Yet the Fifth will not die, but survive for a while: overlapping the new Race for many hundred thousands of years to come, it will become transformed with it—slower than its new successor—still getting entirely altered in mentality, general physique, and stature.

Further, in an article entitled "Premature and Phenomenal Growths" (reprinted in THEOSOPHY 5: 325), H. P. Blavatsky repeats an ancient Asiatic prophecy which asserts that "as the fourth (race) was composed of Red-yellow which faded into Brown-white (bodies), so the fifth will fade out into white-brown (the white races becoming gradually darker) . . . . Thus we find from the above that the characteristics of the race that will follow ours are—a darker skin, shortened period of infancy and old age, or in other words a growth and development that in the present age (to the profane) appear quite miraculous."

EVIDENCE OF THE TIDE

The "broad trend" toward *panmixia* spoken of by Professor Smith in the *Saturday Review* is accompanied by encouraging signs that race prejudice is lessening all over the world. This fact is noted in two current publications, the *Progressive* for January and in the winter number of the *Antioch Review.* The latter journal devotes more than half its space to a survey of opinion on racial questions in the southern United States, entitled "Southerners Look at Desegregation." The several articles in this symposium make it clear that the recent Supreme Court decision to outlaw segregation is strongly approved by a number of influential men below the Mason-Dixon line. For instance, Peter Carmichael, professor of philosophy at Louisiana State University, begins his essay with the following paragraph:

> After nearly a century a new emancipation proclamation makes real what has been only nominal or fictitious. The public school desegregation decision of the United States Supreme Court abolishes, as far as judicial action can, one of the most conspicuous vestiges of Amer-

> ican slavery. It rescues, as far as law can, the still oppressed Negro, and eases the way for the white oppressor to throw off the shackles of his mind, to rid himself of his peculiar, superinduced complex and become free himself. It actualizes the first section of the fourteenth Amendment by making unambiguous and concrete the rights of Negroes in public education.

While two of the contributors to the *AR* symposium point out that the transition will require time and patience, and should not be rushed by theorists unfamiliar with deeply ingrained southern attitudes, all the contributions show an awareness that this is not a "southern problem," but simply a problem in basic humanity.

Particularly interesting to Theosophists should be the comments of Rayford W. Logan, professor of history at Howard University. Professor Logan is outspoken in calling attention to the discreditable role played by Christian orthodoxy in justifying segregation policy:

> Opponents of desegregation have, of course, invoked the Bible and their own interpretation of religion to justify segregation just as slaveholders sought to justify slavery. Unless this religious crusade has the strength to apply Christian and ethical principles to desegregation, the number of disillusioned scoffers will almost certainly increase. It is not too much to say that undue prolonging of segregation will weaken the moral posture of the United States in world affairs and will make the "American Dream" seem like a myth.

A Correspondent's Impression

Richard Rovere, Washington correspondent for the *New Yorker,* articulates the impression of many observers in the January *Progressive,* when he reflects upon the marked diminution of race prejudice in everyday converse. As Rovere thought the matter over, it became evident that those who still revealed ethnic prejudice exhibited "a strange defensive note and very commonly a sense of guilt behind such expressions." Mr. Rovere continues:

> I could be wrong, and many people have said flatly that I am, but I believe that certain forms of race prejudice and zenophobia have been declining much more rapidly than anyone has publicly acknowledged. In this season, I believe that such acknowledgments should be made. I admit that I am directed to my happy conclusion more by the inner voices of intuition than by knowledge empirically acquired. Such evidence as I have is largely personal, and it may be faulty—mere coincidence, perhaps, or a misreading of experience, or the result of leading, unknowingly and unbelievingly, a sheltered

existence. But I don't think so, and without further ado or apology I state my case.

Psychological Change

Aided by such remarks as these, a Theosophist may find evidence that Western nations are finally dispersing the karmic clouds of slavery. Even if Soviet propaganda has played a part in forcing U.S. policy-makers to stand for racial equality, then, some underlying reasons for the welcome transition may be suggested by H. P. Blavatsky's prophecies. In the short space of the past two years a number of observers have discovered ground for Mr. Rovere's optimism, which he further elaborates:

> I became aware of this within the past year, when I observed, to my surprise, that I had stopped being guarded. It dawned on me that it had been quite a while since I had run into the kind of prejudice that seemed so common and offensive a feature of American life a while back. To test this impression, I began deliberately to lead into subjects that I thought likely to bring out what prejudices existed among the people I was with. The impression I had was very largely confirmed. I simply don't hear the kind of comments I used to hear—or, rather, I hear them much, much less often than I used to, and when I do hear them they are different somehow.

Buddha in CinemaScope—and Color

A recent Hollywood news release (Los Angeles *Times,* Dec. 24) reports that Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer has now completed plans to "film the life of Gautama Buddha." Hedda Hopper advertises the project with the following comments:

> The life of Gautama Buddha, extraordinary warrior-prince who founded a way of life which now numbers more than 500 million followers, will be made into a motion picture by MGM. Known as the great teacher, Buddha was an outstanding swordsman and horseman who renounced his royal heritage at the age of 29 to become a penniless wanderer. After six years of suffering, he achieved enlightenment. The story was prepared and written by Robert Hardy Andrews after two years of research. He recently returned from his second tour of India where he had long sessions with Nehru, who is 100% behind the project. Andrews will be associate producer with Edwin Knopf, and much of the movie will be filmed in color and CinemaScope in India.

The Return of an Ancient

It would be grossly inaccurate to remark that Buddha is "becoming popular" today, since the profound influence of Buddhist scripture and religion has extended over the whole of Asia for some 2000 years. In the West, however, it was not until the long-range effects of the Theosophical Movement of the last century had been felt in the scholarly world that translations of Buddhist precepts and discourses began to be considered subjects worthy of study. This is not to imply that the T.S. of 1875 was alone responsible for the new view on Eastern religion which has gradually developed, but the concerted efforts of Theosophists did assure maximum attention to the numerous translations and renditions provided by orientalists. Finally, liberal Christian ministers and a number of influential psychotherapists discovered inspiration in the universality of Buddhist philosophy.

So now the story of Buddha from "the other side of the world," reaches the films. It is interesting now to note that Hedda Hopper reports Prime Minister Nehru's verbal support of the project; no one should know better than Nehru the importance of bridging the gap between Eastern and Western thought in as many ways as possible, and in such a manner as to increase the Western public's general comprehension of the Eastern religious temper—so different from the "eye-for-an-eye" doctrine of our own theologies. It is only to be hoped that the film spectacle will reach some level of inspiration in its portrayal, and bring into focus the unique elements of the Buddhist perspective.

The Theosophy of Buddha

Every religion has something to say about the moral life; while Buddhism is no exception, and furnishes a list of prohibitions, what remains distinctive is that the primary stress is upon comprehension rather than "salvation." Not escape from evil, but entrance into another level of psychological existence, is the end in view. Hence, while Buddhism is concerned with morality, it is not moralistic. The "laws of the soul" are given, but it is presumed that each will come to make his own application of them, and, in fact, if any man, after hearing The Law, chooses to ignore its implications, this is strictly his own affair. For no agency, human or divine, rewards or punishes the Buddhist. He builds for bliss or woe in future lives according to thoughts and deeds initiated in this one.

It is of record, and a fact of considerable significance, that scholars have had difficulty in deciding whether Buddhism is a "religion" at all. Not only is the authority of a personal God missing, but other familiar forms of "certainty" we customarily identify with religions are missing also.

The essential key to Buddha's outlook is that there is no holiness without psychological knowledge, no spiritual progress for the man who does not know himself. And in the knowing, if he be in any way like Buddha, he must refrain from all oversimplifications of the ethical problem—those unfortunate hallmarks of conventional religions.

"Only Bloodless Religion"

Buddhist perspective on the crucial subject of ethics and morality bears obvious and direct relationship to the remarkable absence of violence in Buddhist history. H. P. Blavatsky wrote that Buddhism "is the only *absolutely bloodless* religion among all the existing religions: tolerant and liberal, teaching universal compassion and charity. . . . No persecutions, and enforcements of faith by fire and sword, have ever disgraced it." The reason for this extraordinary record is not difficult to discern, for it has been self-righteousness—the desire to prove oneself more godly than one's fellows, and the temptation to believe that "one's own sins" can be expiated by punishment of other wrongdoers—which has made the story of Christian nations such dark reading.

"Nothing Can Destroy It"

A current news story (Los Angeles *Mirror,* Dec. 12) alludes to the Buddhist "doctrine of non-injury" in relation to the present political tension in Asia. Robert H. Andrews, just returned from a fact-finding tour of the Orient for the purpose of providing background for the motion picture on Buddha's life, reports that Buddhist influence is particularly important at the present time. He writes that "there are 500,000,000 Buddhists in Asia and 200,000,000 of them are inside Red China." The *Mirror* story continues:

> Andrews said that the Buddhists won't say they are fighting Communism. "Instead they say, 'We will make our way of life so strong, that nothing can destroy it.' "
>
> Can the doctrine of non-injury to any living thing, as taught by Buddha, withstand the onslaught of the Communist war machine?
>
> "I'm certain it can," the writer asserted.

Andrew's opinion in this instance is clearly that of Thomas Paine, who once wrote that "an army of principles can penetrate where an army of men cannot." For he also remarked to the *Mirror* reporter, that, as he sees it, the present Buddhist revival "poses a greater threat to Asiatic Communism than the atom bomb."

BACKGROUND OF NON-VIOLENCE

There is no doubt that political thinkers throughout the world occasionally regard with some envy the demonstration of India's ability to practice "passive resistance" against oppression. For it is easily seen that behind this technique of defense lies a discipline which makes incitement to warlike acts most difficult.

A Bombay correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian* contributed an explorative article on the subject of Indians' capacities in this regard (Sept. 30, 1954), in which he pointed out the extent to which the outlook of reincarnation has contributed confidence to those who attempt the non-violent approach. Mr. Tanya Zinkin writes:

> Jainism and Buddhism, both developments of Hinduism, are religions of non-violence, and both have left a strong impress on India. This concern for God's living creatures, be they of the humblest, has greatly influenced non-Moslem India, which believes in reincarnation. The Brahmins have always embodied human perfection and have been held up as examples for the non-Brahmins to achieve through reincarnation. Brahmins are wise men, not boxing blues. Most Indians have taken their cue from them. The Indian way to bring pressure is by social sanction, not force. Tradition successfully substitutes caste boycotts for lynchings; and boycotts were until yesterday non-violence's most dreadful weapon.

"DEEP-ROOTED EXPERIENCE"

The *Guardian* correspondent continues:

> It is this deep-rooted experience of their society rather than a rhetorical attachment to non-violence which makes Indians realise more vividly than other people how successful non-violence is. Against real and universal non-violence not even the Kremlin could stand, for communism rests at the very least on the fear of the millions; and the truly non-violent are fearless. The cheerful acceptance of torture and death is as fundamental to non-violence as the refusal to hit back or to hate.

Thus, over the course of centuries, an effective tradition of *individual* action against evil has grown, providing background for development

of larger social mechanisms able to utilize the same principle. For instance, in India "the creditor fasted on his debtor's doorstep and neither could eat until the debt was repaid, as it almost always was. Maltreated wives resort to hunger strikes and silent non-co-operation; few indeed are the husbands heartless enough to remain above pressure when wives starve 'sweetly,' while servants, and neighbours cast them for the role of Bluebeard. No wife, so far as is known, has yet had to die of hunger to get her way posthumously."

Prospects for the Future

Though "realistic" students of political history will doubtless disagree with him, the *Guardian* correspondent projects these instances as to the nature of Indian temperament into the future—with particular reference to the prospects of Communist invasion:

> If India were conquered and occupied, or if there were to be a successful Communist coup, passive resistance could be very successful. The last war has proved the disadvantages of violence in occupied territories. If India's national heroes are killed or gaoled, people will not co-operate; if they are underground, they themselves will lead civil disobedience with the efficiency of practice. And India is such a vast country; so dependent on extended communications, yet so self-contained in its villages; its towns are so few, its villages so many; its industrialisation so restricted, its proletariat so marginal; its holdings so small and Communists so few that victory would turn into defeat—not through non-violence, but through passive non-co-operation.

Analysis of Fear

Especially since the publication of Bonaro Overstreet's *Understanding Fear,* and in consideration of its subsequent popularity, attention of psychological researchers has turned toward this subject, and efforts have been made toward putting the findings in statistical form. A fairly detailed report from one such research group, published in the Los Angeles *Times* ("This Week," Oct. 10), will be of some interest to readers of THEOSOPHY.

According to the *Times,* the chief culprit in generating fear is an over-active imagination. To eliminate irrational fears, or at least to lessen their pressure, a positive attitude is required:

> Many of your fears you can completely eliminate just by going into *action*—instead of merely "stewing" about them.

> Sort your fears and anxieties into two piles: those which result from conditions beyond your control and those you can *do* something about—and take immediate action on the latter.
>
> The late psychologist, Dr. Henry C. Link, found that a great many fears result from an over-active mind and an under-active body, pointing out that "we generate fears while we sit; we overcome them by action."

This correlation of pervasive fears and the imagination reminds us of the way H.P.B. coupled fear and imagination in the last paragraph of "Hypnotism and its Relation to other Modes of Fascination": "Half, if not two-thirds of our ailings and diseases are the fruit of our imagination and fears. Destroy the latter and give another bent to the former, and nature will do the rest."

FEAR AND EGOCENTRICITY

Bonaro Overstreet, on the other hand, feels that "the failure to move from self-centeredness to responsiveness to people is man's most disastrous failure," and the chief cause of his irrational fears. In this regard, she says:

> Sound development of personality requires "ever expanding identifications" (Slavson) .... Whether identification stops where the family leaves off or where the nation leaves off, it is *provincial* so long as its boundaries are regarded as fixed and natural; not as simply the product of limited experience.

This idea of "ever expanding identifications" correlates with the theosophical concept of humanity as an integral whole. When a man begins to integrate his desires with the needs of *all others,* personal fears and worries lose their power; and he is *able* to "give another bent" to his imagination.